

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

2012 INTAKE STUDY

August 2013

**Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
Gary C. Mohr, Director**

Conducted by:

**Bureau of Research and Evaluation,
Department of Rehabilitation and Correction**

Tables	Jim Bates
Text	Jim Bates

Data and Report Preparation and Support
Alycia Barnett
Jim Bates
Reeda Boyd

Editing	Steve Van Dine
----------------	-----------------------

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Coding of Offender History Information

- Classification Specialists (Bureau of Research and Evaluation)
Alycia Barnett
Jim Bates
Reeda Boyd

Assistance at DRC Reception Centers

- Thanks to all the staff who enabled the Bureau of Research & Evaluation to efficiently collect demographic and social characteristics information from the offenders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv-vi
Executive Summary.....	vii-viii
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Caveats Regarding the Data	2
Representativeness of Sample.....	2
Structure of the Report.....	3
Demographic and Social Characteristics.....	4-14
Characteristics of Current Commitment Offense.....	15-25
Prior Criminal History.....	26-36
ORAS Assessments	37-42
Assessment of SB2 Impact.....	43-44

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

1	Gender.....	4
2	Ethnicity.....	4
3	County of Commitment.....	4-6
4	Age at Commitment.....	7
5	Marital Status at Arrest.....	8
6	Employment Status at Arrest.....	8
7	Education Level at Arrest.....	9
8	Primary Living Arrangement from Birth to Age 18.....	9
9	Indication of Physical Abuse as a Child or Adolescent.....	10
10	Indication of Sexual Abuse as a Child or Adolescent.....	10
11	History of Mental Health Problems.....	10
12	Indication of Recent Drug Abuse.....	11
13	Indication of a History of Drug Abuse.....	11
14	Indication of Recent Alcohol Abuse.....	12
15	Indication of a History of Alcohol Abuse.....	12
16	Indication of the Completion of Substance Abuse Treatment.....	13
17	Living Arrangement at Time of Arrest.....	13
18	Number of Dependent Children at Time of Arrest.....	14

CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT COMMITMENT OFFENSE

19	Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	15-16
20	Felony Level-Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	17
21	Adjudication of Offender's Case.....	18
22	Gun Specifications In The Commitment.....	18
23	Length of Stay for Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	19
24	Type of Drug Involved in Any of the Instant Conviction Offenses.....	20
25	Offender's Legal Status at Arrest for the Conviction Offense.....	21
26	Whether Offender Violated Felony Probation or Parole Conditions.....	21
27	Role of the Offender and Others in the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	22
28	Weapon Used/Possessed During Conviction Offense.....	22
29	Type of Weapon Used During Conviction Offense.....	23
30	Drugs/Alcohol Used During Conviction Offense.....	23
31	Primary Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	24
32	Gender of Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	24
33	Victim Involvement in the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	24
34	Extent of Victim Injury from the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	25
35	Extent of Victim Psychological Harm from the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	25

PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

36	Age at First Arrest.....	26
37	Age at Arrest for First Violent Offense.....	26
38	Age at First Arrest Leading to a Delinquency Adjudication or Adult Felony Conviction.....	27
39	Number of Juvenile Violent (Non-Sex) Offenses.....	27
40	Number of Juvenile Sex Offenses.....	28
41	Number of Juvenile Drug Use/Possession Offenses.....	28
42	Number of Juvenile Drug Sale/Trafficking Offenses.....	28
43	Number of Juvenile DUI/OMVI Offenses.....	29
44	Number of Juvenile Property Offenses.....	29
45	Number of Juvenile Social Service Placements.....	29
46	Number of Commitments to Department of Youth Services.....	30
47	Number of Juvenile Supervision Terms.....	30
48	Number of Juvenile Probation Continuance Terms.....	30
49	Number of Revocations of Juvenile Supervision Terms.....	31
50	Number of Adult Non-Violent Misdemeanor Convictions.....	31
51	Number of Prior Adult DUI/OMVI Convictions.....	31
52	Number of Prior Adult Violent Misdemeanor Convictions.....	32
53	Number of Domestic Violence Convictions.....	32
54	Number of Prior Adult Jail Incarcerations.....	32
55	Number of Prior Adult Felony Convictions [Total].....	33
56	Number of Prior Adult Violent (Non-Sex) Felony Convictions.....	33
57	Number of Prior Adult Sex Felony Convictions.....	33
58	Number of Prior Adult Drug Use/Possession Felony Convictions.....	34
59	Number of Prior Adult Drug Sale/Trafficking Felony Convictions.....	34
60	Number of Adult Property Felony Convictions.....	34
61	Number of Prior Adult Prison Incarcerations.....	35
62	Number of Prior Adult Supervision Terms.....	35
63	Number of Prior Revocations of Adult Supervision.....	35
64	Indication of an Escape History.....	36

ORAS ASSESSMENT TABLES

65	Assessment Type	37
66	PST Assessment Availability	37
67	PST Assessment Score Distribution... ..	38
68	PST Assessment Risk Level	38
69	PST and PIT-PST Assessment Score Distribution	39
70	PST and PIT-PST Assessment Risk Level.....	39
71	PST and PIT-PIT Assessment Score Distribution	40
72	PST and PIT-PIT Assessment Risk Level	41
73	PIT Assessment Only- PIT Assessment Score Distribution.....	41
74	PIT Assessment Only- PIT Assessment Risk Level	42

ASSESSMENT OF SB2 IMPACT

A	Proportion of Each Year's Intake Who were Truly Non Violent	43
B	Proportion of Each Year's TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators	43
C	Proportion of Each Year's Total Intake Who were Probation Violators	43
D	Proportion of Each Year's Total Intake Who were Parole/PRC Violators	44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Social and Demographic Characteristics

- Of the 2926 offenders included in the study, 87.6% were male and 12.4% were female. [Table 1]
- The racial composition of the intake sample was: 38.0% African American, 59.2% Caucasian, and 2.8% all other categories. [Table 2]
- The ten counties with the greatest numbers of offenders committed to Ohio prisons during the intake study period were: Cuyahoga (N=466; 15.9%), Hamilton (N=296; 10.1%), Franklin (N=258; 8.8%), Summit (N=183; 6.3%), Montgomery (N=123; 4.2%), Stark (N=91; 3.1%), Lucas (N=87; 3.0%), Butler (N=80; 2.7%), Clermont (N=58; 2.0%) and Lake (N=57; 2.0%). [Table 3]
- The average age at commitment of offenders in the intake study was 32.7 years and the median age was 31. Males had an average age of 32.5 and a median age of 30. Females had an average age of 33.9 and a median age of 31. [Table 4]
- At the time of arrest for the instant offense, 65.8% of the offenders were unemployed; 22.3% were employed full-time. Males were more likely to have been employed full time (23.3%) than females (15.4%). [Table 6]

Current Most Serious Commitment Offense

- Over a third of the males (34.3%) were incarcerated for committing a crime against persons (including sex offenses) as their most serious offense. Just under one-fourth (23.5%) of the males were convicted for committing a drug offense. Over one-third (34.4%) of the females were incarcerated for committing a drug offense as their most serious offense, while approximately one-fifth were incarcerated for a miscellaneous property offense (19.8%) and just over one-fifth (20.4%) for committing crimes against persons (including sex offenses). [Table 19]
- The five offenses (most serious commitment offense) for which the male and female offenders in the sample were most often committed were: [Table 20]

MALES		FEMALES	
Burglary	11.2%	Theft	14.3%
Drug Possession	9.8%	Drug Possession	14.3%
Drug Trafficking	9.6%	Drug Trafficking	11.3%
Robbery	6.8%	Burglary	6.9%
Theft	5.9%	Illegal Mfg Drugs	4.7%

- A quarter (25.0%) of the males and a third (33.6%) of the females in the study were incarcerated with an expected length of stay of just over 6 months to 12 months. Overall, 41.5% of the offenders have an expected length of stay of no more than one year in prison. [Table 23]
- Weapons were involved or present, in some manner, in the conviction offense in 26.4% the cases (male = 28.9%; female =9.1%). [Table 28]

Criminal History

- Men were more likely than women to have served a prior prison term (male = 53.8%; female = 29.2%). Just over half of the entire intake sample has served a prior prison term (50.7%). [Table 61]
- Over three-fourths of all offenders have had at least one prior adult supervision term (male = 78.4%; female = 79.4%). [Table 62]. Women were more likely to have at least one prior revocation of adult supervision (male = 52.8%; female = 60.4%). [Table 63]
- Over six in ten offenders (63.8%) had at least one prior adult felony conviction (male = 65.9%; female = 48.7%). [Table 55]
- One-fifth of the offenders (20.0%) have had at least one domestic violence conviction as an adult or juvenile (male = 22.7% female = 2.8%). [Table 53]

ORAS Assessments

- Over half (54.3%) of the offenders in the study had only a Prison Screening Tool (PST) assessment. Another 41.7% had both PST and Prison Intake Tool (PIT) assessments. [Table 65]
- Males had only a PST assessment available in 50.1% of the cases while females had only a PST assessment in 84% of the cases. [Tables 65]
- Overall, counting both PST assessments alone and PST/PIT combinations, PST assessments were available for 95.7% of the males and 97.8% of the females. [Table 66]
- The PST assessment Risk Level Placed 36.3% of the males and 70.2% of the females in the Low Risk Level Category. Accordingly, 63.7% of the males and 29.8% of the females scored as moderate/high. [Table 68]
- Offenders with both a PST and a PIT had a PIT score that placed them low (males 17.3%; females 28%), moderate (males 43.1%; females 54%), high (males 32.4% ; females 18%) or very high (males 7.3%; females 0%) on the PIT Assessment Risk Level. [Tables 72]

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present a basic profile of newly committed inmates entering the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) prison system for a new commitment from common pleas courts during 2012. The profile of Intake 2012 inmates includes the following information: (1) demographic and social characteristics of the inmates, (2) characteristics of the current commitment offense, (3) the inmate's prior criminal history and (4) risk assessment scoring. These tables may be used to compare the characteristics of inmates entering the prison system across the years for which similar data have been collected (1985, 1992, 1996 to 1998 and 2000 to 2011). Copies of many of the reports are available at: <http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/reports/reports18.asp>.

Methodology

In general, data for intake studies are collected on all inmates who enter the DRC prison system over a one and a half to two month period for a new commitment from a common pleas court. Information is obtained from seven primary sources:

- (1) Interviews with inmates at reception centers;
- (2) Written investigations;
- (3) The OnBase information system, with offender background reports available in digitized form;
- (4) County web sites;
- (5) Ohio Courts Network (OCN);
- (6) LEADS and
- (7) OHLEG

The interviews with the inmates, conducted by DRC classification specialists, take place at DRC's three reception centers. Male interviews are conducted at the Lorain Correctional Institution and the Correctional Reception Center. Females are interviewed at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The interview emphasis is on social history information not consistently available in offender files. Bureau of Research and Evaluation Offender History staff code this information into the Intake database.

If a basic written offender investigation (often a PSI) is available, key variables are collected from that investigation. However, with such a large data collection effort, it is inevitable that some of the necessary information on offenders will be missing from the investigation reports. When information is missing, classification specialists must obtain copies of documents available online in digitized form on inmates from the records bureau at Central Office, the Ohio Courts Network (OCN), the Ohio Law Enforcement Gateway, (OHLEG) and county court records. The classification specialists read through the available information and attempt to retrieve the missing information.

Information was collected on all inmates who entered the DRC prison system starting May 7th, 2012 and concluding June 29th, 2012. The resulting data set contains information on a sample of 2,926 newly committed inmates received by DRC during this period. This is used for a basic intake profile report and several more detailed reports. One is a report on Truly Non-Violent Offenders for 2012. Second, side-by-side county comparison tables for the ten highest committing counties as well as individualized county profiles for those counties have been started. Another is a Short Term Offender Report.

Caveats Regarding the Data

There are several limitations to the data of which the reader should be aware when assessing this information. First, the reader should bear in mind that the characteristics of the offense apply to the most serious conviction offense only. One should be cautious when trying to establish the proportion of offenders serving time for particular offenses. For example, an offender may have been convicted for felonious assault and domestic violence. The proportion of offenders currently entering prison for domestic violence will be underestimated when looking only at the proportion of offenders committed for domestic violence as the most serious offense.

A more accurate representation may be found by also considering offenders for whom domestic violence was the second most serious offense; however, we are not able to identify the number of offenders committed for domestic violence as a third or fourth most serious offense. While we believe that considering the most and second most serious offenses captures important offense characteristics for the majority of offenders entering prison for any given offense, estimates using this database must be considered conservative estimates. Similar precautions should be taken when estimating the various proportions of victim characteristics and other variables associated with particular offenses.¹ The database also does not contain information on the number of counts of offenses upon which the inmate was sentenced.

A second concern regards juvenile offense data. The availability of juvenile records continues to be problematic. Many county juvenile courts have a policy of refusing access to juvenile records; some will permit access only with a signed waiver from the inmate. Other juvenile courts routinely destroy juvenile records for individuals born before a specific date. As a result, the completeness of the juvenile record information remains questionable. In addition, the severity of juvenile offenses is difficult to determine due to the varying types of records of juvenile criminal behavior. Great care should be taken when attempting to draw conclusions from juvenile criminal history information contained in the intake databases.

Several limitations of criminal histories in general should be noted. The reader should be aware that the intake adult offense information is only for prior adult convictions. Few conclusions can be drawn regarding arrests from the data. An exception is that the number of arrests for five years prior to the instant offense is recorded in the intake database, although not reported herein.

There is no data recorded on indictment charges nor plea-bargaining for prior convictions. For example, it is possible that an inmate was, at some previous time, charged with a violent offense but agreed to plead guilty to a lesser, non-violent offense. As a result, there may be a number of individuals in the Intake database who are identified as having no prior convictions for violent offenses, but they actually do have a history of violent behavior.

Representativeness of the Sample

It is important to note how representative this cohort of inmates is when compared to the inmates being admitted throughout the year. The Intake 2012 sample should be comparable to inmates admitted during CY 2012. The information below, taken from the CY 2012 Commitment Report, illustrates that the Intake 2012 sample closely resembles the year's intake on several basic features.

¹ For inquiries that require a greater degree of specificity, please contact the Bureau of Research and Evaluation for additional analysis.

	INTAKE 2012 %	COMM. CY2012 %
<u>Sex</u>		
Female	12.4	12.8
Male	87.6	87.2
<u>Race</u>		
African American	38.0	39.5
Caucasian	59.2	57.7
<u>Counties of Commitment</u>		
Cuyahoga	15.9	17.0
Hamilton	10.1	9.6
Franklin	8.8	8.4
Summit	6.3	5.7
Montgomery	4.2	4.9
<u>Type of Offense</u>		
Crimes Against Persons	26.2	25.5
Sex Offenses	6.4	7.1
Burglary Offenses	12.0	12.3
Property Offenses	14.1	14.1
Drug Offenses	24.9	24.3
Motor Vehicle Offenses	1.9	1.6
Fraud Offenses	2.4	2.0
Weapons Offenses	5.7	6.0
Justice and Public Administration	6.5	7.1
Other Offenses	0.0	0.1
<u>Mean Age in Years</u>		
Female	33.9	32.5
Male	32.5	32.4

This comparison suggests strongly that the Intake 2012 sample is representative of all inmates admitted into ODRC's prisons in 2012.

Structure of the Report

This report is organized into five data sections. The first section presents the demographic and social characteristics of the 2012 Intake sample. The second section provides information on the characteristics of the most serious current commitment offense. Information regarding the offender's prior criminal history is presented in section three. ORAS risk assessment information is in section four. Section five includes some trend information and an assessment of legislative impact. In reviewing the tables, please be aware that due to rounding, percentages may not total exactly to 100%. This condition may be true for any table in this report. In addition, percentages in the text are rounded to one decimal place from the two places in the tables.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE 1: Gender

GENDER	N	%
Male	2563	87.6
Female	363	12.4
TOTAL	2926	100.0

Of the 2,926 offenders included in the study, roughly 88% were male and 12% were female.

TABLE 2: Race/ Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Asian	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
African American	1038	40.50	75	20.66	1113	38.04
Caucasian	1447	56.46	285	78.51	1732	59.19
Native American	3	0.12	1	0.28	4	0.14
Other	71	2.77	2	0.55	73	2.49
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

The racial composition of the intake sample was: .14% Asian, 38% African American, 59.2% Caucasian, .14% Native American and 2.5% Other.

TABLE 3: County of Commitment

COUNTY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adams	5	0.20	2	0.55	7	0.24
Allen	16	0.62	2	0.55	18	0.62
Ashland	5	0.20	1	0.28	6	0.21
Ashtabula	10	0.39	0	0.00	10	0.34
Athens	10	0.39	4	1.10	14	0.48
Auglaize	8	0.31	2	0.55	10	0.34
Belmont	8	0.31	1	0.28	9	0.31
Brown	16	0.62	4	1.10	20	0.68
Butler	69	2.69	11	3.03	80	2.73
Carroll	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Champaign	12	0.47	2	0.55	14	0.48
Clark	45	1.76	6	1.65	51	1.74
Clermont	45	1.76	13	3.58	58	1.98

COUNTY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clinton	13	0.51	7	1.93	20	0.68
Columbiana	12	0.47	2	0.55	14	0.48
Coshocton	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Crawford	15	0.59	2	0.55	17	0.58
Cuyahoga	426	16.62	40	11.02	466	15.93
Darke	6	0.23	0	0.00	6	0.21
Defiance	12	0.47	1	0.28	13	0.44
Delaware	16	0.62	6	1.65	22	0.75
Erie	18	0.70	6	1.65	24	0.82
Fairfield	22	0.86	9	2.48	31	1.06
Fayette	10	0.39	1	0.28	11	0.38
Franklin	233	9.09	25	6.89	258	8.82
Fulton	6	0.23	1	0.28	7	0.24
Gallia	8	0.31	2	0.55	10	0.34
Geauga	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Greene	30	1.17	6	1.65	36	1.23
Guernsey	12	0.47	1	0.28	13	0.44
Hamilton	270	10.53	26	7.16	296	10.12
Hancock	10	0.39	1	0.28	11	0.38
Hardin	6	0.23	3	0.83	9	0.31
Harrison	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Henry	5	0.20	2	0.55	7	0.24
Highland	15	0.59	1	0.28	16	0.55
Hocking	5	0.20	1	0.28	6	0.21
Holmes	7	0.27	0	0.00	7	0.24
Huron	13	0.51	3	0.83	16	0.55
Jackson	8	0.31	1	0.28	9	0.31
Jefferson	17	0.66	2	0.55	19	0.65
Knox	8	0.31	0	0.00	8	0.27
Lake	48	1.87	9	2.48	57	1.95
Lawrence	18	0.70	5	1.38	23	0.79
Licking	39	1.52	5	1.38	44	1.50
Logan	6	0.23	0	0.00	6	0.21
Lorain	43	1.68	3	0.83	46	1.57
Lucas	80	3.12	7	1.93	87	2.97
Madison	24	0.94	2	0.55	26	0.89
Mahoning	51	1.99	3	0.83	54	1.85
Marion	39	1.52	4	1.10	43	1.47
Medina	26	1.01	5	1.38	31	1.06
Meigs	6	0.23	1	0.28	7	0.24
Mercer	8	0.31	2	0.55	10	0.34
Miami	21	0.82	2	0.55	23	0.79

COUNTY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Monroe	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Montgomery	106	4.14	17	4.68	123	4.20
Morgan	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Morrow	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Muskingum	23	0.90	3	0.83	26	0.89
Noble	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Ottawa	3	0.12	1	0.28	4	0.14
Paulding	5	0.20	1	0.28	6	0.21
Perry	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Pickaway	16	0.62	5	1.38	21	0.72
Pike	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Portage	29	1.13	4	1.10	33	1.13
Preble	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
Putnam	8	0.31	0	0.00	8	0.27
Richland	26	1.01	4	1.10	30	1.03
Ross	30	1.17	4	1.10	34	1.16
Sandusky	10	0.39	1	0.28	11	0.38
Scioto	15	0.59	8	2.20	23	0.79
Seneca	17	0.66	4	1.10	21	0.72
Shelby	15	0.59	5	1.38	20	0.68
Stark	78	3.04	13	3.58	91	3.11
Summit	162	6.32	21	5.79	183	6.25
Trumbull	28	1.09	6	1.65	34	1.16
Tuscarawas	5	0.20	1	0.28	6	0.21
Union	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
Van Wert	7	0.27	0	0.00	7	0.24
Vinton	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
Warren	28	1.09	7	1.93	35	1.20
Washington	10	0.39	2	0.55	12	0.41
Wayne	14	0.55	2	0.55	16	0.55
Williams	7	0.27	1	0.28	8	0.27
Wood	24	0.94	8	2.20	32	1.09
Wyandot	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

The ten counties with the greatest numbers of offenders committed to Ohio prisons during the intake study period were: Cuyahoga (N=466; 15.9%), Hamilton (N=296; 10.1%), Franklin (N=258; 8.8%), Summit (N=183; 6.3%), Montgomery (N=123; 4.2%), Stark (N=91; 3.1%), Lucas (N=87; 3.0%), Butler (N=80; 2.7%), Clermont (N=58; 2.0%) and Lake (N=57; 2.0%).

TABLE 4: Age at Commitment

AGE AT COMMITMENT	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under 18	7	0.27	0	0.00	7	0.24
18	46	1.79	0	0.00	46	1.57
19	100	3.90	2	0.55	102	3.49
20	97	3.78	6	1.65	103	3.52
21	106	4.14	7	1.93	113	3.86
22	125	4.88	14	3.86	139	4.75
23	97	3.78	17	4.68	114	3.90
24	100	3.90	20	5.51	120	4.10
25	96	3.75	14	3.86	110	3.76
26	95	3.71	9	2.48	104	3.55
27	112	4.37	19	5.23	131	4.48
28	116	4.53	19	5.23	135	4.61
29	98	3.82	17	4.68	115	3.93
30	88	3.43	20	5.51	108	3.69
31	107	4.17	20	5.51	127	4.34
32	79	3.08	14	3.86	93	3.18
33	81	3.16	18	4.96	99	3.38
34	74	2.89	8	2.20	82	2.80
35	61	2.38	12	3.31	73	2.49
36	61	2.38	10	2.75	71	2.43
37	82	3.20	8	2.20	90	3.08
38	68	2.65	7	1.93	75	2.56
39	45	1.76	5	1.38	50	1.71
40	52	2.03	8	2.20	60	2.05
41-45	248	9.68	40	11.02	288	9.84
46-50	155	6.05	21	5.79	176	6.02
51-55	106	4.14	18	4.96	124	4.24
56-60	36	1.40	5	1.38	41	1.40
Over 60	25	0.98	5	1.38	30	1.03
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mean = 32.48	Mean = 33.85	Mean = 32.65
Median = 30.00	Median = 31.00	Median = 31.00

The mean age of offenders in the intake study was 32.7 years and the median age was 31. Males had an average age of 32.5 and a median age of 30. Females had a mean age of 33.9 and a median age of 31. Seven offenders (0.24%) were under the age of 18 at the time of admission to prison and 195 (6.7%) were older than 50.

TABLE 5: Marital Status at Arrest at Arrest
Missing: 16

MARITAL STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single, Never Married	1806	70.77	196	54.75	2002	68.80
Married	271	10.62	55	15.36	326	11.20
Separated	151	5.92	32	8.94	183	6.29
Divorced	311	12.19	61	17.04	372	12.78
Widowed	13	0.51	14	3.91	27	0.93
TOTAL	2552	100.00	358	100.00	2910	100.00

At the time of arrest (for the current most serious commitment offense), almost seven-in-ten (68.8%) of the offenders were single (never married), 11.2% were married and approximately 20.0% were separated, widowed, or divorced. Men were more likely to have never been married (70.8%) than women (54.8%).

TABLE 6: Employment Status at Arrest
Missing: 58

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unemployed*	1616	64.38	271	75.70	1887	65.79
Employed Part-time	155	6.18	25	6.98	180	6.28
Employed Full-time	584	23.27	55	15.36	639	22.28
Self-Employed	109	4.34	6	1.68	115	4.01
Temporary Agency	40	1.59	1	0.28	41	1.43
Seasonal Employment	6	0.24	0	0.00	6	0.21
TOTAL	2510	100.00	358	100.00	2868	100.00

* Includes those who claim working under-the-table.

At the time of arrest for the instant offense, 63.7% of the offenders were unemployed and 22.3% were employed full-time. Males were more likely to have been employed full time (23.3%) than females (15.4%).

TABLE 7: Education Level at Arrest
Missing: 140

EDUCATION LEVEL	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Education Completed	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.04
1st Grade	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.04
3rd Grade	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.11
4th Grade	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.04
5th Grade	7	0.29	0	0.00	7	0.25
6th Grade	11	0.45	1	0.28	12	0.43
7th Grade	21	0.87	4	1.11	25	0.90
8th Grade	112	4.58	13	3.60	125	4.45
9th Grade	213	8.62	37	10.25	250	8.83
10th Grade	257	10.27	28	7.76	285	9.94
11th Grade	305	12.25	35	9.70	340	11.92
HS Diploma	409	16.87	57	15.79	466	16.73
Voc Training + HS Diploma	134	5.53	30	8.31	164	5.89
GED	464	19.13	54	14.96	518	18.59
GED+ Voc Training	49	2.02	0	0.00	49	1.76
Attended College	370	15.26	77	21.33	447	16.04
AA/AS Degree	43	1.77	11	3.05	54	1.94
BA/BS Degree	18	0.74	7	1.94	25	0.90
MA/MS Degree	5	0.21	7	1.94	12	0.43
PhD	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.04
TOTAL	2425	100.00	361	100.00	2786	100.00

At the time of arrest, the educational attainment of the males was as follows: 6.5% had an eighth grade education or less, 32.0% had some high school, 43.5% were high school graduates or the equivalent but had not attended college; 15.3% had some college but had not graduated and 2.8% had attained a college degree. The respective education rates for females were: 5.0%, 27.7%, 39.1%, 21.3% and 6.9%.

TABLE 8: Primary Living Arrangement from Birth to Age 18
Missing: 44

LIVING ARRANGEMENT	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lived with Both Parents	1116	44.22	158	44.13	1274	44.21
Lived with Mother Only	1036	41.05	125	34.92	1161	40.28
Lived with Father Only	114	4.52	19	5.31	133	4.61
Lived with Grandparents	177	7.01	37	10.34	214	7.43
Lived with Other Relatives	39	1.55	3	0.84	42	1.46
Lived with Foster Parents	35	1.39	15	4.19	50	1.73
Lived in Juvenile Institution	7	0.28	1	0.28	8	0.28
TOTAL	2524	100.00	358	100.00	2882	100.00

Males and females were similar in regard to being raised by both parents (males 44.2%; females 44.1%). Males were more likely than females to have been raised by their mother alone (males 41.1%; females 34.9%). Females were more likely to have been raised by their grandparents (male = 7.0%; female= 10.3%). If there are multiple responses to the variable, it is coded for the longest lasting living arrangement.

TABLE 9: Indication of Physical Abuse as a Child or Adolescent**Missing: 47**

EVIDENCE OF PHYSICAL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	2354	93.30	266	74.72	2620	91.00
Yes	169	6.70	90	25.28	259	9.00
TOTAL	2523	100.00	356	100.00	2879	100.00

The data collected from self admissions, social and criminal history records indicate that the female inmates in the sample had a much higher percentage of physical abuse as a child or adolescent (male = 6.7%; female = 25.3%).

TABLE 10: Indication of Sexual Abuse as a Child or Adolescent**Missing: 30**

EVIDENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	2409	94.88	240	67.23	2649	91.47
Yes	130	5.12	117	32.77	247	8.53
TOTAL	2539	100.00	357	100.00	2896	100.00

Female inmates in the sample indicated a much higher percentage of sexual abuse as a child or adolescent than their male counterparts (male = 5.1%; female = 32.8%).

TABLE 11: History of Mental Health Problems**Missing: 16**

HISTORY OF MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1795	70.42	177	49.03	1972	67.77
Self-Admission/Evidence	173	6.79	138	38.23	311	10.69
Diagnosed with Mental Illness	29	1.14	5	1.39	34	1.17
Treated for Mental Illness	552	21.66	41	11.36	593	20.38
TOTAL	2549	100.00	361	100.00	2910	100.00

Females in the study were more likely to have had a history of mental health problems than males (male = 29.6%; female = 51.0%).

TABLE 12: Indication of Recent Drug Abuse ***Missing: 6**

INDICATION OF RECENT DRUG ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	567	22.17	72	19.89	639	21.88
Self Admission/Evidence	1946	76.08	287	79.28	2233	76.47
Diagnosis	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Treatment of Drug Abuse	44	1.72	3	0.83	47	1.61
TOTAL	2558	100.00	362	100.00	2920	100.00

*Within 6 months of arrest.

Concerning the prevalence of inmates involved in recent drug abuse, female offender rates were slightly higher than males (male = 77.8%; female = 80.1%). Overall, forty-seven offenders (1.6%) had received treatment within the six months prior to their arrest (male = 1.7%; female = 0.83%).

TABLE 13: Indication of a History of Drug Abuse***Missing: 5**

INDICATION OF HISTORY OF DRUG ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	262	10.24	57	15.70	319	10.92
Self Admission/Evidence	1699	66.42	288	79.34	1987	68.02
Diagnosis of Drug Abuse	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Treatment of Drug Abuse	596	23.30	18	4.96	614	21.02
TOTAL	2558	100.00	363	100.00	2921	100.00

*More than 6 months prior to arrest.

Males were more likely than females to have had a history of drug abuse (male = 89.8% female = 84.3%). These numbers are quite consistent with numbers from past years. However, only about one-fifth of the offenders in the intake study (21.0%) had received drug treatment at some time in the past (male = 23.3%; female = 4.96%). There is a substantial decrease in the amount of females that had prior drug treatment indicated. The drop is just over 38 percentage points from last year. Correspondingly there is an increase of almost 34 percentage points in the number of females admitting to, or having evidence of, a prior drug problem. We know of no good explanation for the sudden shift, and we encourage that the figures on treatment be used with great caution.

TABLE 14: Indication of Recent Alcohol Abuse***Missing: 14**

INDICATION OF RECENT ALCOHOL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	1643	64.46	261	71.90	1904	65.38
Self Admission/Evidence	877	34.41	102	28.10	979	33.62
Diagnosis	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Treatment of Alcohol Abuse	27	1.06	0	0.00	27	0.93
TOTAL	2549	100.00	363	100.00	2912	100.00

*Within 6 months of arrest.

Over one-third (35.6%) of the males had indications of recent alcohol abuse. Females had indications of recent alcohol abuse in 28.1% of the cases.

TABLE 15: Indication of a History of Alcohol Abuse***Missing: 10**

INDICATION OF HISTORY OF ALCOHOL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	901	35.29	235	64.74	1136	38.96
Self Admission/Evidence	1214	47.55	116	31.96	1330	45.61
Diagnosis of a Problem	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Treatment of Alcohol Abuse	437	17.12	12	3.31	449	15.40
TOTAL	2553	100.00	363	100.00	2916	100.00

*More than 6 months prior to arrest.

Data indicated that males and females were quite different in regard to having indications of prior alcohol abuse (males=64.7%; females 35.3%). Male numbers are quite consistent with patterns from past years. Males were much more likely to have had prior treatment for an alcohol problem (male = 17.1%; female = 3.3%). However, the female figures at all levels are very different from previous years. We know of no good explanation for the sudden shift, and we encourage that the 2012 figures on alcohol abuse and treatment for women be used with great caution.

TABLE 16: Indication of the Completion of Substance Abuse Treatment
Missing: 15

INDICATION OF TREATMENT PROGRAM COMPLETION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication of Treatment	1373	53.89	119	32.78	1492	51.25
Failure to Comply with Court	241	9.46	106	29.20	347	11.92
Began Treatment/Compliance Unknown	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
Completed Treatment	706	27.71	76	20.94	782	26.86
Treatment After Arrest Only	223	8.75	62	17.08	285	9.79
TOTAL	2548	100.00	363	100.00	2911	100.0

Male offenders were more likely than females to have completed substance abuse treatment at some time prior to their arrest on the instant offense. (males =27.7% ; females = 20.9%) Overall, over a tenth (males, 9.7% and females 29.2%) failed to comply with court orders for treatment or began treatment and their compliance was unknown. Some of the offenders, 8.8% of the males and 17.1% of the females, began substance abuse treatment only after their arrest for the instant offense.

TABLE 17: Living Arrangement at Time of Arrest
Missing: 60

LIVING ARRANGEMENT AT TIME OF ARREST	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alone	408	16.25	50	14.08	458	15.98
w/Domestic Partner	366	14.58	68	19.15	434	15.14
w/Domestic Partner and Children	554	22.06	50	14.08	604	21.07
w/Dependent Children	44	1.75	59	16.62	103	3.59
w/Adult Children	17	0.68	3	0.85	20	0.70
w/Parent/Guardian	649	25.85	59	16.62	708	24.70
w/Adult Sibling	101	4.02	3	0.85	104	3.63
w/Grandparents	89	3.54	11	3.10	100	3.49
w/Other Relative	77	3.07	16	4.51	93	3.24
w/Friend/Roommate	96	3.82	21	5.92	117	4.08
Homeless	91	3.62	13	3.66	104	3.63
Supervised Setting	19	0.76	2	0.56	21	0.73
TOTAL	2511	100.00	355	100.00	2866	100.00

At the time of their arrest, males were most likely to live with a parent or guardian (25.9%) while females lived with a parent or guardian 16.6% of the time. Females were more likely to be living with a domestic partner without children (19.2%) than with a domestic partner and children (14.1). Also, females were much more likely to live with their dependent children (16.6%) compared to the males (1.8%).

TABLE 18: Number of Dependent Children at Time of Arrest
Missing: 33

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN AT TIME OF ARREST	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1933	76.28	217	60.45	2150	74.32
One	214	8.45	49	13.65	263	9.09
Two	198	7.81	51	14.21	249	8.61
Three	118	4.66	21	5.85	139	4.80
Four	42	1.66	15	4.18	57	1.97
Five	19	0.75	4	1.11	23	0.80
Six or more	10	0.39	2	0.56	12	0.41
TOTAL	2534	100.00	359	100.00	2893	100.00

Just under one-fourth, (23.7%) of the male offenders and 39.6% of the female offenders, had dependent children living with them at the time of arrest. Counting only those offenders who had lived with dependent children, the mean number of children living with the males was 2.1 and for female offenders the number was 2.2.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT COMMITMENT OFFENSE

TABLE 19: Most Serious Conviction Offense*

OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS	697	27.19	70	19.28	767	26.21
Abduction	12	0.47	1	0.28	13	0.44
Aggravated Arson	11	0.43	1	0.28	12	0.41
Aggravated Assault	36	1.40	3	0.83	39	1.33
Aggravated Murder	10	0.39	0	0.00	10	0.34
Aggravated Robbery	82	3.20	1	0.28	83	2.84
Aggravated Vehicular Assault	12	0.47	8	2.20	20	0.68
Aggravated Vehicular Homicide	8	0.31	1	0.28	9	0.31
Assault	18	0.70	5	1.38	23	0.79
Contamination of Food	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Contributing To Non-Support Of Dependents	46	1.79	3	0.83	49	1.67
Domestic Violence	99	3.86	1	0.28	100	3.42
Endangering Children	11	0.43	6	1.65	17	0.58
Felonious Assault	107	4.17	16	4.41	123	4.20
Harassment By Inmate	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Intimidation	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Inducing Panic	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Involuntary Manslaughter	7	0.27	5	1.38	12	0.41
Kidnapping	14	0.55	1	0.28	15	0.51
Murder	25	0.98	1	0.28	26	0.89
Retaliation	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Permit Child Abuse	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Robbery	175	6.83	16	4.41	191	6.53
Voluntary Manslaughter	5	0.20	1	0.28	6	0.21
Menacing	6	0.23	0	0.00	6	0.21
Extortion	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
SEX OFFENSES / REGISTRATION	183	7.14	4	1.10	187	6.39
Compelling Prostitution	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Duty to Register as a Sex Offender	0	0.00	1	0.28	1	0.03
Gross Sexual Imposition	31	1.21	1	0.28	32	1.09
Importuning	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
Pandering Obscenity Involving a Minor	15	0.59	0	0.00	15	0.51
Periodic Verification of Address (Sex Offender)	14	0.55	0	0.00	14	0.48
Public Indecency	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Failure To Notify Change Of Address	36	1.40	0	0.00	36	1.23
Rape	47	1.83	0	0.00	47	1.61
Sexual Battery	10	0.39	1	0.28	11	0.38
Unlawful Sexual Conduct with a Minor	22	0.86	1	0.28	23	0.79
Voyeurism	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
BURGLARY OFFENSES	327	12.75	25	6.89	352	12.03
Aggravated Burglary	41	1.60	0	0.00	41	1.40
Burglary	286	11.16	25	6.89	311	10.63
MISCELLANEOUS PROPERTY CRIMES	340	12.27	72	19.83	412	14.08
Arson	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
Breaking & Entering	93	3.63	4	1.10	97	3.32
Disrupting Public Services	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Receiving Stolen Property	74	2.89	13	3.58	87	2.97
Safecracking	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
Theft	151	5.89	52	14.33	203	6.94
Theft in Office	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Unauthorized Use of Vehicle	1	0.04	1	0.28	2	0.07
Vandalism	9	0.35	2	0.55	11	0.38

*The characteristics of the committing offenses are based on the *most serious conviction offense* only. Some offenders may have been incarcerated for a number of offenses, but the characteristics reported to be associated with the commitment crime reflect the information as it relates to the most serious conviction offense only.

OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
DRUG OFFENSES	603	23.53	125	34.44	728	24.88
Corrupting Another with Drugs	3	0.12	1	0.28	4	0.14
Deception to Obtain Dangerous Drug	10	0.39	8	2.20	18	0.62
Drug Possession	251	9.79	52	14.33	303	10.36
Drug Trafficking	247	9.64	41	11.29	288	9.84
Illegal Mfg of Drug or Cultivation of Marihuana	82	3.20	17	4.68	99	3.38
Illegal Processing of Drug Documents	4	0.16	2	0.55	6	0.21
Permitting Drug Abuse	1	0.04	3	0.83	4	0.14
Sale Counterfeit Drugs	1	0.04	1	0.28	2	0.07
Drug Law	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Abuse Harmful Intoxicants	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
MOTOR VEHICLE OFFENSES	50	1.95	4	1.10	54	1.85
Operating Motor Vehicle Under the Influence	49	1.91	4	1.10	53	1.81
Lifetime License Suspension	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
FRAUD OFFENSES	46	1.79	23	6.34	69	2.36
Forgery	30	1.17	14	3.86	44	1.50
Insurance Fraud	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Misuse of Credit Card	1	0.04	1	0.28	2	0.07
Passing Bad Checks	4	0.16	1	0.28	5	0.17
Taking Identity of Another	5	0.20	5	1.38	10	0.34
Tampering with Records	4	0.16	2	0.55	6	0.21
Trademark Counterfeiting	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
WEAPONS OFFENSES	156	6.09	12	3.31	168	5.74
Carrying a Concealed Weapon	27	1.05	1	0.28	28	0.96
Firearm Specification	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Having a Weapon Under Disability	111	4.33	0	0.00	111	3.79
Improper Handling of Firearm	11	0.43	1	0.28	12	0.41
Bringing Weapons into a Detention Facility	5	0.20	10	2.75	15	0.51
OFFENSES AGAINST JUSTICE/PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	161	6.28	28	7.71	189	6.46
Engaging in Pattern of Corrupt Activity	18	0.70	7	1.93	25	0.85
Escape	25	0.98	4	1.10	29	0.99
Failure to Appear	3	0.12	2	0.55	5	0.17
Fail to Stop Accident	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Intimidation of Victim/Witness	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
Obstructing Justice	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Participation in a Gang	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
Possessing Criminal Tools	6	0.23	0	0.00	6	0.21
Tampering with Evidence	25	0.98	12	3.31	37	1.26
Traffic in Food Stamps	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Violating Protection Order	9	0.35	0	0.00	9	0.31
Violation Release own Recognizance	6	0.23	2	0.55	8	0.27
Aggravated Riot	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Fail to Comply	55	2.15	1	0.28	56	1.91
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

*Note: Attempted offenses are included in the primary categories.

Over a third of the males (34.3%) were incarcerated for committing a crime against persons (including sex offenses) as their most serious offense. Just under one fourth (23.5%) of the males were convicted for committing a drug offense. Over one-third (34.4%) of the females were incarcerated for committing a drug offense as their most serious offense, while approximately one-fifth were incarcerated for a miscellaneous property offense (19.8%) and an additional one-fifth (20.4%) for committing crimes against persons (including sex offenses).

The top five offenses in the 2012 intake sample were:

MALES

Burglary	11.2%
Drug Possession	9.8%
Drug Trafficking	9.6%
Robbery	6.8%
Theft	5.9%

FEMALES

Theft	14.3%
Drug Possession	14.3%
Drug Trafficking	11.3%
Burglary	6.9%
Illegal Mfg Drugs	4.7%

OVERALL

Burglary	10.6%
Drug Possession	10.4%
Drug Trafficking	9.8%
Theft	6.9%
Robbery	6.5%

TABLE 20: Felony Level-Most Serious Conviction Offense

FELONY LEVEL	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Death	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Life	31	1.21	0	.00	31	1.06
1st	265	10.34	16	4.41	281	9.60
2nd	447	17.44	50	13.77	497	16.99
3rd	724	28.25	92	25.34	816	27.89
4th	515	20.09	81	22.31	596	20.37
5th	580	22.63	124	34.16	704	24.06
Total	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

Overall, less than half (44.4%) of the offenders in the study were sentenced on felony four or five offenses (males 42.7%; females 56.5%).

TABLE 21: Adjudication of Offender’s Case
Missing: 3

ADJUDICATION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Guilty Plea	2526	98.67	363	100.00	2889	98.84
Convicted by Judge/Jury	34	1.33	0	0.00	34	1.16
TOTAL	2560	100.00	363	100.00	2923	100.00

Overwhelmingly, offenders (98.8%) pled guilty to charges (male = 98.7%; female = 100.0%).

TABLE 22: Gun Time In Conviction

GUN SPECIFICATION TIME IN CONVICTION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2407	93.91	354	97.52	2761	94.36
1 Year	62	2.42	6	1.65	68	2.32
2 Years	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
3 Years	69	2.69	3	0.83	72	2.46
5 Years	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
6 Years	15	0.59	0	0.00	15	0.51
7 Years	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
9 Years	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
11 Years	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

Firearm specifications were added to convictions in 6.1% of the male cases and 2.5% of the female cases. Three-year specifications were the most prevalent for males, making up 44.2% of the male specifications. One-year specifications accounted for two-thirds of the female gun year specifications.

TABLE 23: Expected Length of Stay for Most Serious Conviction Offense*
Missing:2

LENGTH OF STAY (IN YEARS)	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
6 Months or Less	379	14.80	73	20.11	452	15.46
Over 6 Mo to 1 Yr	640	24.99	122	33.61	762	26.06
To 1.5 Yr	272	10.62	36	9.92	308	10.53
To 2.0 Yr	275	10.74	39	10.74	314	10.74
To 2.5 Yr	125	4.88	17	4.68	142	4.86
To 3.0 Yr	212	8.28	22	6.06	234	8.00
To 3.5 Yr	56	2.19	6	1.65	62	2.12
To 4.0 Yr	144	5.62	17	4.68	161	5.51
To 4.5 Yr	59	2.30	2	0.55	61	2.09
To 5.0 Yr	84	3.28	10	2.75	94	3.21
To 6.0 Yr	75	2.93	7	1.93	82	2.80
To 7.0 Yr	44	1.72	1	0.28	45	1.54
To 8.0 Yr	32	1.25	3	0.83	35	1.20
To 9.0 Yr	16	0.62	3	0.83	19	0.65
To 10.0 Yr	25	0.98	0	0.00	25	0.85
To 11.0 Yr	10	0.39	1	0.28	11	0.38
To 12.0 Yr	17	0.66	0	0.00	17	0.58
To 13.0 Yr	10	0.39	1	0.28	11	0.38
To 14.0 Yr.	9	0.35	2	0.55	11	0.38
To 15.0 Yr	10	0.39	0	0.00	10	0.34
To 20.0 Yr	35	1.37	1	0.28	36	1.23
More Than 20 Yr	32	1.25	0	0.00	32	1.09
Total	2561	100.00	363	100.00	2924	100.00

*The length of stay is not the actual sentence length. Jail time credit has been deducted from the original length.

About four in ten (39.8%) of the males and over half (53.7%) of the females in the study were incarcerated for a period of one year or less. Overall, 41.5% of the offenders were to serve no more than one year in prison. This table is not the equivalent of the sentence table in previous years. Those tables indicated the length of the specific sentence imposed by the court. This table indicates the expected length of stay after jail time credits and any other known credits are deducted from the original sentence.

TABLE 24: Type of Drug Involved in Any of the Instant Conviction Offenses
Missing: 23

TYPE OF DRUG	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Drugs Involved	1794	70.35	200	56.66	1994	68.69
Drugs Present/Incident	15	0.59	2	0.57	17	0.59
Cocaine, Crack	93	3.65	13	3.68	106	3.65
Cocaine, Powder	52	2.04	22	6.23	74	2.55
Cocaine, Unspecified	99	3.88	0	0.00	99	3.41
Heroin	155	6.08	48	13.6	203	6.99
Marijuana	84	3.29	10	2.83	94	3.24
LSD/Acid	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Crystal Meth/Ice	61	2.39	14	3.97	75	2.58
Amphetamines	2	0.08	1	0.28	3	0.10
Pharmaceuticals	97	3.80	29	8.22	126	4.34
Counterfeit Drugs	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Chemical/Inhalant	38	1.49	4	1.13	42	1.45
Steroids	6	0.24	1	0.28	7	0.24
Drug Residue	5	0.20	4	1.13	9	0.31
Crack Cocaine + Marijuana	2	0.08	2	0.57	4	0.14
Powder Cocaine + Marijuana	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Unspecified Cocaine + Heroin	21	0.82	1	0.28	22	0.76
Unspecified Cocaine + Marijuana	2	0.08	1	0.28	3	0.10
Crack Cocaine + Heroin	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
Ecstasy	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Multiple Drug Types	9	0.35	1	0.28	10	0.34
TOTAL	2550	100.00	353	100.00	2903	100.00

Drugs were involved in 31.3% of the intake overall (males = 29.7%; females = 43.3%). In the 909 instances where drugs were involved in the offense, 115 (12.7%) involved crack cocaine, either by itself or in combination with another drug. In the 2001 intake study crack cocaine made up 54.7% of drug related offenses. Powder cocaine or unspecified cocaine was another 22.1% of the drug related crimes.

Heroin, either alone or in combination with another substance, was involved in 25.3% of the offenses involving drugs in the current study. In the 2001 intake study heroin represented 3.7% of drug offenses.

Pharmaceuticals were involved in 13.9% of the drug related cases in the 2012 intake study. In 2001, pharmaceuticals accounted for only 3.8% of drug offenses.

TABLE 25: Offender’s Legal Status at Arrest for the Conviction Offense
Missing: 7

LEGAL STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Free of CJ Supervision	1437	56.22	177	48.76	1614	55.29
Active Arrest Warrant	17	0.67	0	0.00	17	0.58
Released on Own Recognizance/Bond	116	4.54	4	1.10	120	4.11
On Probation	799	31.26	176	48.48	975	33.40
On Parole	174	6.81	6	1.65	180	6.17
In Jail	7	0.27	0	0.00	7	0.24
In Prison/DYS	6	0.23	0	0.00	6	0.21
TOTAL	2556	100.00	363	100.00	2919	100.00

Less than half of the offenders in the sample (44.7%) were on some type of supervision, warrant, or were incarcerated at the time of their arrest for the instant offense (male = 43.8%; female = 51.2%). The most common status for those under some type of supervision was probation (male = 31.3%; female = 48.5%).

TABLE 26: Whether Offender Violated Felony Probation or Parole Conditions
Missing: 5

VIOLATION STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Offender was not a Violator	1591	62.20	181	49.86	1772	60.66
Technical Probation Violator	458	17.90	128	35.26	586	20.06
New Crime and Technical Violation/Returned to Prison on the Technical Violation	10	0.39	7	1.93	17	0.58
New Crime Probation Violator	333	13.02	42	11.57	375	12.84
New Crime Parole/PRC Violator	166	6.49	5	1.38	171	5.85
TOTAL	2558	100.00	363	100.00	2921	100.00

All the offenders in this sample were entering prison for a new felony conviction and commitment from a county Court of Common Pleas. However, some were on supervision when they committed the offenses for which they were sent to prison. Over one-third of the males (37.8%) and just over one-half of the females (50.2%) in the study were incarcerated on either a technical or new crime violation of felony probation or a new crime violation of parole.

TABLE 27: Role of the Offender and Others in the Most Serious Conviction Offense
Missing: 35

OFFENDER/OTHERS' ROLE(S)	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Offender Acted Alone	2117	83.74	295	81.27	2412	83.43
Others Present, but Not Arrested	22	0.87	2	0.55	24	0.83
One or More Others Charged	72	2.85	10	2.75	82	2.84
One or More Others Went to Trial	7	0.28	2	0.55	9	0.31
One or More Others Convicted, Incarceration Status Unknown	23	0.91	8	2.20	31	1.07
One or More Others Convicted and Incarcerated	224	8.86	40	11.02	264	9.13
One or More Others Prob./Comm. Control	63	2.49	6	1.65	69	2.39
TOTAL	2528	100.00	363	100.00	2891	100.00

Over four-fifths (83.4%) of the offenders acted alone in the commission of the offense for which they were committed (male = 83.7%; female = 81.3%). Overall, in the 479 cases where the offender acted with someone else in the commission of the offense, another offender was also incarcerated in 55.1% of the cases (male = 54.5%; female = 58.8%).

TABLE 28: Weapon Used/Possessed/Present During Conviction Offense
Missing:66

WEAPON USED/POSSESSED/ PRESENT DURING CONVICTION OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Weapon	1774	71.05	330	90.91	2104	73.57
Weapon Incidental to Crime	25	1.00	2	0.55	27	0.94
Weapon Present, but Not Used	183	7.33	0	0.00	183	6.40
Feigned Possession of Weapon	4	0.16	1	0.28	5	0.17
Used by Other Actor w/Offender	24	0.96	1	0.28	25	0.87
Offender Threatened Use	175	7.01	6	1.65	181	6.33
Used in Attempt to Injure	37	1.48	6	1.65	43	1.50
Used Weapon to Injure	237	9.49	12	3.31	249	8.71
Used Weapon to Kill	38	1.52	5	1.38	43	1.50
TOTAL	2497	100.00	363	100.00	2860	100.00

Weapons were involved, or present, in some manner, in the conviction offense in 26.4% of the cases. In the 723 male offenses where weapons were involved, non-fatal injury occurred 32.8% of the time and death occurred in 5.3% of the cases. Females had weapons involved in 33 cases. In 12, or 36.4%, of the cases non-fatal injuries occurred. Death resulted 5 times, or in 15.2% of the cases.

TABLE 29: Type of Weapon Used During Conviction Offense
Missing: 91

TYPE OF WEAPON USED DURING CONVICTION OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Weapon/Incidental	1787	72.23	332	91.97	2119	74.74
Handgun	399	16.13	11	3.05	410	14.46
Rifle-Shotgun	21	0.85	1	0.28	22	0.78
Assault Weapon	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.11
Sharp Instrument	62	2.51	13	3.60	75	2.65
Blunt Instrument	10	0.40	1	0.28	11	0.39
Brute Force/Fists	142	5.74	1	0.28	143	5.04
Other	45	1.82	2	0.55	47	1.66
Multiple Weapons	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.18
TOTAL	2474	100.00	361	100.00	2835	100.00

An actual weapon, aside from brute force/fists, was used in 573 (20.2%) of the cases examined. Males used a weapon in 545 (22.0%) of the cases. In the instances where a weapon was used males used a handgun 73.2% of the time. Sharp instruments were second at 11.4%. Females used a weapon in 28 cases (7.8%) Females more often used a sharp instrument (46.4%) over a handgun (39.3%) at times where a weapon was used.

TABLE 30: Drugs/Alcohol Used During Conviction Offense
Missing: 47

DRUGS/ALCOHOL USED DURING CONVICTION OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	1329	52.80	156	43.09	1485	51.58
Drugs	644	25.59	153	42.27	797	27.68
Alcohol	251	9.97	13	3.59	264	9.17
Both	293	11.64	40	11.05	333	11.57
TOTAL	2517	100.00	362	100.00	2879	100.00

Almost half (48.4%) of the offenders were under the influence of drugs, alcohol or both at the time of at least one of the instant conviction offenses (male = 47.2%; female = 56.9%). Over one-quarter (27.7%) were under the influence of drugs. Females were more likely than males to have been under the influence of drugs (male = 25.6%; female = 42.3%). Males were more likely to have been under the influence of alcohol (10.0%) than females (3.6%). Similarly, males were only slightly more likely than females to be under the influence of both alcohol and drugs at the time of their offense (male = 11.6%; female = 11.1%).

TABLE 31: Primary Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense

Missing: 473

VICTIM RELATIONSHIP TO OFFENDER	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Direct Victim	988	47.09	167	47.04	1155	47.09
Family Member	161	7.67	25	7.04	186	7.58
Friend or Acquaintance	297	14.16	30	8.45	327	13.33
Work or School Associate	9	0.43	1	0.28	10	0.41
Any Corrections or Law Enforcement Employee	38	1.81	4	1.13	42	1.71
Other	3	0.14	2	0.56	5	0.20
Stranger	385	18.35	71	20.00	456	18.59
Non-Personal*	217	10.34	55	15.49	272	11.09
TOTAL	2098	100.00	355	100.00	2453	100.00

*This category includes: business/place of employment, non-profit organization, and state or county government institution/property.

When looking at offenses which have a direct personal victim, 1026 cases, strangers (44.4%) were more likely than friends or acquaintances (31.9%) to be the primary victims of an offense. Family members were listed as the victim in 18.1% of the cases examined.

TABLE 32: Gender of Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense

Missing: 237

VICTIM GENDER	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Non Personal	1205	51.41	221	64.06	1426	53.03
Male	518	22.10	71	20.58	589	21.90
Female	621	26.49	53	15.36	674	25.07
TOTAL	2344	100.00	345	100.00	2689	100.00

In cases where there was a personal victim (N=1263), 53.4% were female and 46.6% were male.

TABLE 33: Victim Involvement in the Most Serious Conviction Offense

Missing: 88

VICTIM INVOLVEMENT	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Personal / Direct Victim	1039	41.88	204	57.14	1243	43.80
No Victim Precipitation	1425	57.44	151	42.30	1576	55.53
Indication of Victim Precipitation	17	0.69	2	0.56	19	0.67
TOTAL	2481	100.00	357	100.00	2838	100.00

Of the most serious conviction offenses, 43.8% did not involve a direct personal victim. In the cases where there was a direct personal victim, 98.8% had no victim precipitation. There were indications of victim involvement in 1.2% of the cases where there was a direct personal victim.

TABLE 34: Extent of Victim Injury from the Most Serious Conviction Offense

Missing: 296

EXTENT OF VICTIM BODILY INJURY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not Applicable (non-personal crime)	1210	52.79	216	63.91	1426	54.22
No Bodily Injury to Victim	841	36.69	93	27.51	934	35.51
Some Bodily Injury – No Treatment Required	59	2.57	1	0.30	60	2.28
Injury w/Medical Treatment Required at Scene Only	17	0.74	2	0.59	19	0.72
Injury Requiring Out Patient Treatment	63	2.75	6	1.78	69	2.62
Injury Requiring In-Patient Hospitalization	50	2.18	12	3.55	62	2.36
Victim was Killed by Offender(s)	52	2.27	8	2.37	60	2.28
TOTAL	2292	100.00	338	100.00	2630	100.00

Over half (54.2%) of the most serious conviction offenses were for non-personal crimes or had no direct victim. Where there was a personal victim (N=1204), 77.6% received no bodily injury as a result of the offense. Treatment was received by 71.4% of the 210 non-fatally injured victims. Offenses resulting in death of the victim occurred in approximately 5.0% of the cases where a personal victim was identified.

TABLE 35: Extent of Victim Psychological Harm from the Most Serious Conviction Offense

Missing: 1006

EXTENT OF VICTIM PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not Applicable (non-personal crime)	1208	75.12	215	68.91	1423	74.11
Not Applicable Because Victim Died	52	3.23	8	2.56	60	3.13
No Psychological Harm was Indicated by the Victim	162	10.07	85	27.24	247	12.86
Victim Sustained Some Psychological Harm/Fear	179	11.13	3	0.96	182	9.48
Victim Sustained Psych. Harm/Required Treatment	7	0.44	1	0.32	8	0.42
TOTAL	1608	100.00	312	100.00	1920	100.00

For several hundred cases in the sample, there was no indication whether the victim had psychological harm. Those cases are part of the “missing” for this table. With those cases removed, approximately three-fourths (74.1%) of the most serious conviction offenses were non-personal crimes. In the cases where personal victims were identified (497), 60 (12.1%) died. Additionally, victims sustained some or significant psychological harm/fear/treatment 38.2% of the time. Victims indicated that no psychological harm/fear resulted from the offense almost half the time (49.7%).

PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

TABLE 36: Age at First Arrest

Missing: 14

AGE AT FIRST ARREST	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Younger than 10	17	0.67	0	0.00	17	0.58
10-14	523	20.49	19	5.29	542	18.61
15-19	1223	47.90	129	35.93	1352	46.43
20-24	468	18.33	100	27.86	568	19.51
25-29	147	5.76	47	13.09	194	6.66
30-34	73	2.86	25	6.96	98	3.37
35-39	37	1.45	15	4.18	52	1.79
40-44	28	1.10	10	2.79	38	1.30
45-49	17	0.67	7	1.95	24	0.82
50 or Older	20	0.78	7	1.95	27	0.93
TOTAL	2553	100.00	359	100.00	2912	100.00

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mean = 19.17	Mean = 23.58	Mean = 19.72
Median = 18.00	Median = 21.00	Median = 18.00

The mean age at first arrest for offenders in the intake study was 19.7 years (male = 19.2; female = 23.6). Seventeen offenders (0.6%), all male, were first arrested before they were ten-years-old. Twenty-seven offenders (0.9%) were first arrested at the age of fifty or older.

Table 37: Age at Arrest for First Violent Offense

AGE AT ARREST FOR FIRST VIOLENT OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Violent Offense Arrest	448	17.48	175	48.21	623	21.29
Less Than 10	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
10-14	278	10.85	9	2.48	287	9.81
15-19	821	32.03	46	12.67	867	29.63
20-24	519	20.25	49	13.50	568	19.41
25-29	235	9.17	34	9.37	269	9.19
30-34	118	4.60	26	7.16	144	4.92
35-39	62	2.42	11	3.03	73	2.49
40-44	36	1.40	4	1.10	40	1.37
45-49	19	0.74	6	1.65	22	0.75
50 or Older	22	0.86	3	0.83	28	0.96
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

<u>Males*</u>	<u>Females*</u>	<u>Total*</u>
Mean = 21.27	Mean = 25.31	Mean = 21.60
Median = 19.00	Median = 24.00	Median = 19.00

*For those who have a violent arrest

For offenders who had ever been arrested for a violent offense, the mean age at their first arrest for a violent offense was 21.6 years. Females (25.3 years) were older than males (21.3 years) at their first arrest for a violent offense. Over three-fourths (82.5%) of the males and over half of the females (51.8%) had an arrest for a violent offense.

TABLE 38 Age at First Arrest Leading to a Delinquency Adjudication or Adult Felony Conviction
Missing: 14

AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Younger than 10	8	0.31	0	0	8	0.27
10-14	469	18.37	19	5.29	488	16.76
15-19	854	33.45	65	18.11	919	31.56
20-24	541	21.19	85	23.68	626	21.50
25-29	251	9.83	74	20.61	325	11.16
30-34	168	6.58	51	14.21	219	7.52
35-39	106	4.15	25	6.96	131	4.50
40-44	81	3.17	21	5.85	102	3.50
45-49	30	1.18	7	1.95	37	1.27
50 or Older	45	1.76	12	3.34	57	1.96
TOTAL	2553	100.00	359	100.00	2912	100.00

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mean = 21.85	Mean = 26.81	Mean = 22.46
Median = 19.00	Median = 25.00	Median = 20.00

The overall mean age in the intake study for the first arrest leading to a delinquency adjudication or adult felony conviction was 22.5 years. Females (26.8) were older than the males (21.9). Eight offenders (0.27%), all male, were less than ten-years-old at the time of their first delinquency adjudication. In total, fifty-seven offenders (1.95%) were age fifty or older at the time of their first conviction (male = 1.8%; female = 3.3%).

TABLE 39: Number of Juvenile Violent (Non-Sex) Offenses
Missing: 368

NUMBER OF JUVENILE VIOLENT (NON-SEX) OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1691	76.83	336	94.12	2027	79.24
One	314	14.27	17	4.76	331	12.94
Two	112	5.09	3	0.84	115	4.50
Three	50	2.27	1	0.28	51	1.99
Four	19	0.86	0	0.00	19	0.74
Five or more	15	0.68	0	0.00	15	0.59
TOTAL	2201	100.00	357	100.00	2558	100.00

Male offenders in the sample were more likely to have one or more adjudications for juvenile violent (non-sex) offenses (male = 23.2%; female = 5.9%). Roughly 3.3% of the overall sample have three or more violent offenses as a juvenile. Given the variations in county juvenile records it is difficult to determine whether these are felony or misdemeanor offenses. This is true for all tables representing juvenile offenses in this study.

TABLE 40: Number of Juvenile Sex Offenses**Missing: 369**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SEX OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2139	97.23	357	100.00	2496	97.61
One	55	2.50	0	0.00	55	2.15
Two	6	0.27	0	0.00	6	0.23
TOTAL	2200	100.00	357	100.00	2557	100.00

The data reflects that 2.8% of the male offenders had sex offenses as a juvenile. None of the females in the study had a juvenile sex offense recorded.

TABLE 41: Number of Juvenile Drug Use/Possession Offenses**Missing: 373**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE DRUG USE/POSSESSION OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2025	92.21	347	97.20	2372	92.91
One	128	5.83	9	2.52	137	5.37
Two	30	1.37	0	0.00	30	1.18
Three or More	13	0.59	1	0.28	14	0.55
TOTAL	2196	100.00	357	100.00	2553	100.00

Drug use/possession offenses as a juvenile were reflected in the records of 7.1% of the intake study.

TABLE 42: Number of Juvenile Drug Sale/Trafficking Offenses**Missing: 371**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE DRUG SALE & TRAFFICKING OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2152	97.91	357	100.00	2509	98.20
One	38	1.73	0	0.00	38	1.49
Two	8	0.36	0	0.00	8	0.31
TOTAL	2198	100.00	357	100.00	2555	100.00

Juvenile drug trafficking offenses were found in 1.8% of the intake sample (male 2.1%; female 0.00%).

TABLE 43: Number of Juvenile DUI/OMVI Offenses
Missing: 371

NUMBER OF JUVENILE DUI/OMVI OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2173	98.86	356	99.72	2529	98.98
One	23	1.05	1	0.28	24	0.94
Two or More	2	0.09	0	0.00	2	0.08
TOTAL	2198	100.00	357	100.00	2555	100.00

Juvenile DUI offenses were found for less than two percent (1.1%) of the offenders in the intake sample. Males accounted for all but one of the offenses.

TABLE 44: Number of Juvenile Property Offenses
Missing: 371

NUMBER OF JUVENILE PROPERTY OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1603	72.93	331	92.72	1934	75.69
One	297	13.51	18	5.04	315	12.33
Two	150	6.82	5	1.40	155	6.07
Three	71	3.23	3	0.84	74	2.90
Four	31	1.41	0	0.00	31	1.21
Five or More	46	2.09	0	0.00	46	1.80
TOTAL	2198	100.00	357	100.00	2555	100.00

Just under one-fourth (24.3%) of the offenders have had a juvenile property offense (males = 27.1%; females = 7.3%).

TABLE 45: Number of Juvenile Social Service Placements
Missing: 369

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SOCIAL SERVICE PLACEMENTS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1849	84.05	342	95.80	2191	85.69
One	200	9.09	11	3.08	211	8.25
Two	70	3.18	2	0.56	72	2.82
Three	33	1.50	2	0.56	35	1.37
Four	18	0.82	0	0.00	18	0.70
Five or More	30	1.36	0	0.00	30	1.17
TOTAL	2200	100.00	357	100.00	2557	100.00

Male offenders (15.9%) are more apt to have juvenile social service placements than the female offenders (4.2%).

TABLE 46: Number of Commitments to Department of Youth Services
Missing: 365

NUMBER OF COMMITMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1842	83.58	354	99.16	2196	85.75
One	240	10.89	1	0.28	241	9.41
Two	82	3.72	2	0.56	84	3.28
Three	21	0.95	0	0.00	21	0.82
Four	18	0.82	0	0.00	18	0.70
Five or More	1	0.05	0	0.00	1	0.04
TOTAL	2204	100.00	357	100.00	2561	100.00

DYS commitments were higher for males than females (male = 16.4%; female = 0.8%). Overall, 14.2% of the intake sample had been committed to DYS.

TABLE 47: Number of Juvenile Supervision Terms
Missing: 370

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SUPERVISION TERMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1465	66.62	319	89.36	1784	69.80
One	399	18.14	22	6.16	421	16.47
Two	216	9.82	12	3.36	228	8.92
Three	82	3.73	3	0.84	85	3.33
Four	22	1.00	1	0.28	23	0.90
Five or More	15	0.68	0	0.00	15	0.59
TOTAL	2199	100.00	357	100.00	2556	100.00

Men were much more likely than women to have been placed on juvenile supervision (male = 33.4%; female = 10.6%).

TABLE 48: Number of Juvenile Supervision Continuance Terms
Missing: 370

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SUPERVISION TERMS CONTINUED	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1878	85.40	339	94.96	2217	86.74
One	117	5.32	11	3.08	128	5.01
Two	76	3.46	6	1.68	82	3.21
Three	51	2.32	1	0.28	52	2.03
Four	33	1.50	0	0.00	33	1.29
Five or More	44	2.00	0	0.00	44	1.72
TOTAL	2199	100.00	357	100.00	2556	100.00

Males were more likely than females to have had a probation continuance (males = 14.6%; females = 5.0%).

TABLE 49: Number of Revocations of Juvenile Supervision
Missing: 371

Number of Revocations of Juvenile Supervision	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2078	94.54	355	99.44	2433	95.23
One	92	4.19	2	0.56	94	3.68
Two	19	0.86	0	0.00	19	0.74
Three	6	0.27	0	0.00	6	0.23
Four	3	0.14	0	0.00	3	0.12
TOTAL	2198	100.00	357	100.00	2555	100.00

Men were more likely than women to have had a revocation of supervision as a juvenile (male = 5.5%; female = 0.6%).

TABLE 50: Number of Prior Adult Non-Violent Misdemeanor Convictions
Missing: 20

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT NON-VIOLENT MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	842	33.06	132	36.77	974	33.52
One	445	17.47	70	19.50	515	17.72
Two	277	10.88	46	12.81	323	11.11
Three	211	8.28	25	6.96	236	8.12
Four	170	6.67	18	5.01	188	6.47
Five or More	602	23.64	68	18.94	670	23.06
TOTAL	2547	100.00	359	100.00	2906	100.00

About two-thirds (66.5%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult conviction for a non-violent misdemeanor (male = 66.9%; female = 63.2%).

TABLE 51: Number of Prior Adult DUI/OMVI Convictions
Missing: 19

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT DUI/OMVI CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2068	81.16	296	82.45	2364	81.32
One	259	10.16	39	10.86	298	10.25
Two	88	3.45	12	3.34	100	3.44
Three	49	1.92	3	0.84	52	1.79
Four	24	0.94	8	2.23	32	1.10
Five or More	60	2.35	1	0.28	61	2.10
TOTAL	2548	100.00	359	100.00	2907	100.00

Men were slightly more likely than women to have had one or more prior adult DUI convictions (male 18.8%; female 17.5%).

TABLE 52: Number of Prior Adult Violent Misdemeanor Convictions**Missing: 20**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT VIOLENT MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1743	68.43	303	84.40	2046	70.41
One	447	17.55	40	11.14	487	16.76
Two	200	7.85	8	2.23	208	7.16
Three	94	3.69	5	1.39	99	3.41
Four	36	1.41	3	0.84	39	1.34
Five or More	27	1.06	0	0.00	27	0.93
TOTAL	2547	100.00	359	100.00	2906	100.00

Just under one third (29.6%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult conviction for a violent misdemeanor (male 31.6%; female = 15.6%).

TABLE 53: Number of Domestic Violence Convictions***Missing: 271**

NUMBER OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1777	77.33	347	97.20	2124	80.00
One	302	13.14	7	1.96	309	11.64
Two	120	5.22	2	0.56	122	4.60
Three	56	2.44	1	0.28	57	2.15
Four	25	1.09	0	0.00	25	0.94
Five or More	18	0.78	0	0.00	18	0.68
TOTAL	2298	100.00	357	100.00	2655	100.00

*Includes both adult and juvenile domestic violence convictions

One-fifth of the offenders (20.0%) have had at least one domestic violence conviction as an adult or juvenile (male = 22.7% female = 2.8%).

TABLE 54: Number of Prior Adult Jail Incarcerations**Missing: 21**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT JAIL INCARCERATIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1173	46.07	239	66.57	1412	48.61
One	502	19.72	59	16.43	561	19.31
Two	288	11.31	24	6.69	312	10.74
Three	192	7.54	12	3.34	204	7.02
Four	118	4.63	5	1.39	123	4.23
Five or More	273	10.72	20	5.57	293	10.09
TOTAL	2546	100.00	359	100.00	2905	100.00

Men were more likely than women to have served at least one prior jail incarceration (male = 53.9% ; female = 33.4%)

TABLE 55: Number of Prior Adult Felony Convictions [Total]**Missing: 16**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	870	34.10	184	51.25	1054	36.22
One	530	20.78	63	17.55	593	20.38
Two	417	16.35	55	15.32	472	16.22
Three	260	10.19	22	6.13	282	9.69
Four	147	5.76	16	4.46	163	5.60
Five or More	327	12.82	19	5.29	346	11.89
TOTAL	2551	100.00	359	100.00	2910	100.00

Over six in ten offenders (63.8%) had at least one prior adult felony conviction (male = 65.9%; female = 48.7%).

TABLE 56: Number of Prior Adult Violent (Non-Sex) Felony Convictions**Missing: 17**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT VIOLENT (NON-SEX) FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1719	67.41	318	88.58	2037	70.02
One	554	21.73	31	8.64	585	20.11
Two	175	6.86	7	1.95	182	6.26
Three	66	2.59	2	0.56	68	2.34
Four	23	0.90	0	0.00	23	0.79
Five or More	13	0.51	1	0.28	14	0.48
TOTAL	2550	100.00	359	100.00	2909	100.00

Less than a third (30.0%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult conviction for a violent (non-sex) felony (male = 32.6%; female = 11.4%).

TABLE 57: Number of Prior Adult Sex Felony Convictions**Missing: 16**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT SEX FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2434	95.41	356	99.16	2790	95.88
One	109	4.27	3	0.84	112	3.85
Two	8	0.31	0	0.00	8	0.27
TOTAL	2551	100.00	359	100.00	2910	100.00

Males were more likely to have adult felony convictions for a sexually oriented crime (male = 4.6%; female = 0.84%).

TABLE 58: Number of Prior Adult Drug Use/Possession Felony Convictions**Missing: 16**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT DRUG USE/ POSSESSION FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1984	77.77	279	77.72	2263	77.77
One	372	14.58	53	14.76	425	14.6
Two	127	4.98	18	5.01	145	4.98
Three	48	1.88	5	1.39	53	1.82
Four	10	0.39	2	0.56	12	0.41
Five or More	10	0.39	2	0.56	12	0.41
TOTAL	2551	100.00	359	100.00	2910	100.00

Just over one-fifth (22.2%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult felony conviction for drug use or possession (male = 22.2%; female = 22.3%).

TABLE 59: Number of Prior Adult Drug Sale/Trafficking Felony Convictions**Missing: 16**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT DRUG SALE/ TRAFFICKING FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2200	86.24	336	93.59	2536	87.15
One	244	9.56	20	5.57	264	9.07
Two	73	2.86	3	0.84	76	2.61
Three	25	0.98	0	0.00	25	0.86
Four	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
Five or More	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
TOTAL	2551	100.00	359	100.00	2910	100.00

Roughly one-in-eight offenders (12.8%) had at least one prior adult felony conviction for drug sale or trafficking (male = 13.8%; female = 6.4%).

TABLE 60: Number of Adult Property Felony Convictions**Missing: 17**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT PROPERTY FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1802	70.67	265	73.82	2067	71.06
One	405	15.88	64	17.83	469	16.12
Two	159	6.24	16	4.46	175	6.02
Three	69	2.71	8	2.23	77	2.65
Four	50	1.96	3	0.84	53	1.82
Five or More	65	2.55	3	0.84	68	2.34
TOTAL	2550	100.00	359	100.00	2909	100.00

Over one-fourth (28.9%) of the offenders had at least one prior felony conviction for property offenses (male = 29.3%; female = 26.2%).

TABLE 61: Number of Prior Adult Prison Incarcerations**Missing: 15**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT PRISON INCARCERATIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1180	46.24	254	70.75	1434	49.26
One	494	19.36	51	14.21	545	18.72
Two	335	13.13	19	5.29	354	12.16
Three	214	8.39	19	5.29	233	8.00
Four	119	4.66	6	1.67	125	4.29
Five or More	210	8.23	10	2.79	220	7.56
TOTAL	2552	100.00	359	100.00	2911	100.00

Men were more likely than women to have served a prior prison term (male = 53.8%; female = 29.2%). Just over half of the entire intake sample has served a prior prison term (50.7%).

TABLE 62: Number of Prior Adult Supervision Terms**Missing: 16**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT SUPERVISION TERMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	552	21.64	74	20.61	626	21.51
One	685	26.85	115	32.03	800	27.49
Two	409	16.03	62	17.27	471	16.19
Three	290	11.37	41	11.42	331	11.37
Four	205	8.04	25	6.96	230	7.90
Five or More	410	16.07	42	11.70	452	15.53
TOTAL	2551	100.00	359	100.00	2910	100.00

Over three-fourths (78.5%) of the offenders have had at least one prior adult supervision term; (male = 78.4%; female = 79.4%).

TABLE 63: Number of Prior Revocations of Adult Supervision Terms**Missing: 15**

NUMBER OF PRIOR REVOCATIONS OF ADULT SUPERVISION TERMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1204	47.18	142	39.55	1346	46.24
One	853	33.42	163	45.40	1016	34.90
Two	290	11.36	33	9.19	323	11.10
Three	98	3.84	12	3.34	110	3.78
Four	60	2.35	6	1.67	66	2.27
Five or More	47	1.84	3	0.84	50	1.72
TOTAL	2552	100.00	359	100.00	2911	100.00

Women were more likely to have at least one prior revocation of adult supervision (male = 52.8%; female = 60.4%).

TABLE 64: Indication of an Escape History
Missing: 5

INDICATION OF AN ESCAPE HISTORY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	2285	89.33	357	98.35	2642	90.45
Yes	273	10.67	6	1.65	279	9.55
TOTAL	2558	100.00	363	100.00	2921	100.00

Males were more likely to have a history of escape (male 10.7%; female 1.6%). It should be noted that many of these escapes are the version created by Senate Bill 2 in 1996 (sustained parole-violator-at-large status can result in an escape offense).

ORAS ASSESSMENTS

DRC in 2011 began to switch from use of the RAP risk assessment instrument to the Ohio Risk Assessment System, a series of coordinated risk instruments that integrated the need assessment process into those risk instruments at different points of the criminal justice system. At the point of admission to prison, two instruments are used. All inmates are expected to be screened with the Prison Screening Tool (PST). If the PST scores at low risk of new criminality after prison, the Prison Intake Tool (PIT) is not administered. Any score above low on the PST is to be given the PIT, although some offenders with a higher than low risk PST may not receive a PIT if the remaining term is less than a year.

TABLE 65: Assessment Type

ASSESSMENT TYPE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Has PST Assessment Only	1283	50.06	305	84.02	1588	54.27
Has PST and PIT Assessment	1170	45.65	50	13.77	1220	41.70
Has PIT Assessment Only	27	1.05	2	0.55	29	0.99
Has No PST, No PIT	83	3.24	6	1.65	89	3.04
TOTAL	2563	100.0	363	100.00	2926	100.00

Over half the inmates in the sample received only a PST. Especially female offenders only received a PST (84.0 %).

ASSESSMENT SCORING

PST: 1=LOW 5=MOD/HIGH

PST (males): (0 thru 1=1) (2 thru hi=5)

PST (females): (0 thru 3=1) (4 thru hi=5)

PIT: 1=LOW 2=MOD 3=HIGH 4=VERY HIGH

PIT (males): (0 thru 8=1)(9 thru 16=2)(17 thru 24=3)(25 thru hi=4)

PIT (females): (0 thru 12=1)(13 thru 18=2)(19 thru hi=3)

TABLE 66: PST Assessment Availability

PST ASSESSMENT AVAILABILITY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Prison Screening Tool (PST)	2453	95.71	355	97.80	2808	95.97
No PST	110	4.29	8	2.20	118	4.03
TOTAL	2563	100.00	363	100.00	2926	100.00

Most of the offenders are shown as having a PST assessment (males 95.7%; females 97.8%).

PST ASSESSMENT ONLY

Over half of the sample in the intake study (54.27%) had only a PST assessment.

TABLE 67: PST Assessment Score Distribution

SCORE FOR THOSE WITH PST ASSESSMENT ONLY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	171	13.33	24	7.87	195	12.28
1	294	22.92	37	12.13	331	20.84
2	244	19.02	51	16.72	295	18.58
3	240	18.71	102	33.44	342	21.54
4	228	17.77	62	20.33	290	18.26
5	85	6.63	25	8.20	110	6.93
6	21	1.64	4	1.31	25	1.57
TOTAL	1283	100.00	305	100.00	1588	100.00

PST: 1=Low 5=Mod/High

PST (males): (0 thru 1=1) (2 thru hi=5)

PST (females): (0 thru 3=1) (4 thru hi=5)

The PST scores ranged from zero to six. The overall mean PST score was 2.40 (males 2.31; females 2.76).

TABLE 68: PST Assessment Risk Level

PST Assessment	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low (1)	466	36.32	214	70.16	680	42.82
High (5)	817	63.68	91	29.84	908	57.18
TOTAL	1283	100.00	305	100.00	1588	100.00

PST: 1=Low 5=Mod/High

PST (males): (0 thru 1=1) (2 thru hi=5)

PST (females): (0 thru 3=1) (4 thru hi=5)

A low risk level for females was almost twice that for males (males = 36.32%; females = 70.16%). Overall, 42.8% had a low risk level category on the PST assessment.

PST and PIT ASSESSMENT

Almost half of the offenders in the study (41.70%) had both a PST and a PIT assessment.

TABLE 69: PST and PIT Assessment- PST Assessment Score Distribution

FOR THOSE WITH BOTH A PST AND PIT PST ASSESSMENT SCORE DISTRIBUTION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0.00	54	4.62	1	2.00	55	4.51
1.00	97	8.29	2	4.00	99	8.11
2.00	284	24.27	3	6.00	287	23.52
3.00	316	27.01	2	4.00	318	26.07
4.00	263	22.48	27	54.00	290	23.77
5.00	115	9.83	14	28.00	129	10.57
6.00	41	3.50	1	2.00	42	3.44
TOTAL	1170	100.00	50	100.00	1220	100.00

PST: 1=Low 5=Mod/High

PST (males): (0 thru 1=1) (2 thru hi=5)

PST (females): (0 thru 3=1) (4 thru hi=5)

Offenders with both a PST and a PIT assessment had an overall mean score of 3.02 on the PST assessment. Males had a mean score of 2.98 while females had a mean score of 3.96.

TABLE 70: PST and PIT Assessment- PST Assessment Risk Level

GROUPING BY PST Assessment	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low (1)	151	12.91	8	16.00	159	13.03
High (5)	1019	87.09	42	84.00	1061	86.97
TOTAL	1170	100.00	50	100.00	1220	100.00

PST: 1=Low 5=Mod/High

The PST assessment risk level category for those inmates with both PST and PIT assessments is shown in Table 70. If the scoring had stopped after the PST, then these 159 offenders grouped in the Low Risk Level category should not have a PIT. This suggests that some additional information arrived that caused a PIT to be administered. (Another possible explanation is that a PIT was done by mistake, as there were lots of difficulties still being worked out in the first year of ORAS use.)

TABLE 71: PST and PIT Assessment- PIT Assessment Score Distribution

PIT Assessment Score Distribution	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0.00	1	0.09	0	0.00	1	0.08
1.00	6	0.51	0	0.00	6	0.49
2.00	11	0.94	0	0.00	11	0.90
3.00	12	1.03	0	0.00	12	0.98
4.00	15	1.28	1	2.00	16	1.31
5.00	29	2.48	0	0.00	29	2.38
6.00	35	2.99	0	0.00	35	2.87
7.00	45	3.85	1	2.00	46	3.77
8.00	48	4.10	1	2.00	49	4.02
9.00	43	3.68	1	2.00	44	3.61
10.00	62	5.30	3	6.00	65	5.33
11.00	51	4.36	5	10.00	56	4.59
12.00	64	5.47	3	6.00	67	5.49
13.00	61	5.21	4	8.00	65	5.33
14.00	67	5.73	2	4.00	69	5.66
15.00	76	6.50	8	16.00	84	6.89
16.00	80	6.84	4	8.00	84	6.89
17.00	71	6.07	4	8.00	75	6.15
18.00	55	4.70	4	8.00	59	4.84
19.00	45	3.85	4	8.00	49	4.02
20.00	64	5.47	3	6.00	67	5.49
21.00	41	3.50	1	2.00	42	3.44
22.00	45	3.85	0	0.00	45	3.69
23.00	25	2.14	0	0.00	25	2.05
24.00	33	2.82	0	0.00	33	2.70
25.00	30	2.56	0	0.00	30	2.46
26.00	18	1.54	0	0.00	18	1.48
27.00	10	0.85	0	0.00	10	0.82
28.00	6	0.51	0	0.00	6	0.49
29.00	8	0.68	0	0.00	8	0.66
30.00	7	0.60	1	2.00	8	0.66
31.00	3	0.26	0	0.00	3	0.25
33.00	2	0.17	0	0.00	2	0.16
36.00	1	0.09	0	0.00	1	0.08
Total	1170	100.00	50	100.00	1220	100.00

PIT (males): (0 thru 8=1)(9 thru 16=2)(17 thru 24=3)(25 thru hi=4)

PIT (females): (0 thru 12=1)(13 thru 18=2)(19 thru hi=3)

For those who had both PST and PIT assessments, the overall PIT assessment mean score was 14.95. The male mean score was 14.96 and the female mean score was 14.80.

TABLE 72: PST and PIT Assessment- PIT Assessment Risk Level

PIT Assessment Risk Level	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low (1)	202	17.26	15	30.00	217	17.79
Moderate (2)	504	43.08	26	52.00	530	43.44
High (3)	379	32.39	9	18.00	388	31.80
Very High (4)	85	7.26	0	0.00	85	6.97
Total	1170	100.00	50	100.00	1220	100.00

PIT: 1=Low 2=Mod 3=High 4=Very High

PIT (males): (0 thru 8=1)(9 thru 16=2)(17 thru 24=3)(25 thru hi=4)

PIT (females): (0 thru 12=1)(13 thru 18=2)(19 thru hi=3)

This group of 1220 inmates had both PST and PIT scores, but the PIT score was used to place the offenders in a Risk Level group. Almost half the men and over half the women were placed in the Moderate grouping, with the High grouping the next largest.

PIT ASSESSMENT ONLY

PIT scores for those handful of inmates with only a PIT score are summarized below.

TABLE 73: PIT Assessment Only-PIT Assessment Score Distribution

PIT Assessment Score Distribution	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5.00	2	7.41	0	0.00	2	6.90
8.00	2	7.41	0	0.00	2	6.90
9.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.45
10.00	2	7.41	1	50.00	3	10.34
12.00	2	7.41	0	0.00	2	6.90
13.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.45
14.00	3	11.11	0	0.00	3	10.34
15.00	3	11.11	0	0.00	3	10.34
16.00	2	7.41	0	0.00	2	6.90
17.00	2	7.41	0	0.00	2	6.90
18.00	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	3.45
19.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.45
20.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.45
22.00	3	11.11	0	0.00	3	10.34
23.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.45
28.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.45
Total	27	100.00	2	100.00	29	100.00

PIT (males): (0 thru 8=1)(9 thru 16=2)(17 thru 24=3)(25 thru hi=4)

PIT (females): (0 thru 12=1)(13 thru 18=2)(19 thru hi=3)

The overall PIT assessment mean score for offenders having only a PIT assessment was 14.79 (males 14.79 ; females 14.0).

TABLE 74: PIT Assessment Only-PIT Assessment Risk Level

PIT Assessment Risk Level	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low (1)	4	14.81	1	50.00	5	17.24
Moderate (2)	14	51.85	1	50.00	15	51.72
High (3)	8	29.63	0	.00	8	27.59
Very High (4)	1	3.70	0	.00	1	3.45
Total	27	100.00	2	100.00	29	100.00

PIT: 1=Low 2=Mod 3=High 4=Very High

The PIT assessment risk level for those inmates with only a PIT assessment was most frequently at the Moderate level.

Assessment of SB2 Impact

The percentage of inmates admitted who were truly non-violent (TNV) was 23.2% in the 2012 Intake Study, with a 4.7 percentage point decrease from the 2011 Intake Study. See Table A, below. A TNV offender is one who has no violent current conviction or indictment offense, no prior felony or misdemeanor conviction for a violent (except F2 or F3 burglary) or sex offense, no gun time, and no weapon involvement in the current offense. In the 1992 and 1996 Intake Studies (which included only Pre-Senate Bill 2 inmates), the percentage of truly non-violent inmates was 44.4%. This figure declined to roughly 40 percent in the 1997 and 1998 Intake Studies, and then dropped slowly but steadily to 29.7% in 2005. The figure then reversed and rose slightly but steadily until 2008. Since then it has decreased 8.7 percentage points.

Table A-Proportion of Each Year’s Intake Who were Truly Non Violent (TNV), in %

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
44.4	40.0	39.9	38.6	35.8	33.9	33.2	31.5	29.7	30.7	31.9	31.9	29.1	27.8	27.9	23.2

Proportion of Each Year’s TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators

In 2012, the percentage of TNV offenders who were supervision (parole or probation) violators increased to 50.7%. This increase of 8.0 percentage points puts the proportion of violators closest to where it was in 1997 and continues to reverse declines in 2009 and 2010. See Table B below, titled “TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators”, to follow the patterns since 1996.

Table B: Proportion of Each Year’s TNV Intake who were Supervision Violators, in %

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
36.0	50.0	54.0	49.4	45.8	53.3	53.6	44.2	44.4	40.4	40.8	43.5	39.5	34.4	42.4	50.7

Proportion of each Year’s Total Intake who were Probation Violators

The percentage of all admissions that were probation violators (Table C, below) has been relatively stable since 1996, with the proportion generally between one-third and one-quarter of commitments. The 4.4 percentage point increase in 2012 to 33.4% continues an increase noted in the 2011 Intake Study and falls between the rates in the 2002 and 2003 studies.

Table C: Proportion of each Year’s Total Intake Who were Probation Violators, in %

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
30.0	35.0	39.0	36.6	33.6	35.6	32.5	32.8	30.5	30.8	29.2	30.6	27.9	25.6	29.0	33.4

Proportion of Each Year's Total Intake Who were Parole/PRC Violators

At 5.9% the percentage of new admissions that had committed a new crime while on parole or post release control in the 2012 Intake Study was slightly higher than that of 2011 but still less than the 2010 number. (Table D, below) The rate in the 2012 Intake Study is 3.2 times higher than in the 1996 study.

TABLE D: Proportion of Each Year's Intake Who were Parole/PRC Violators

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
1.8	2.5	3.1	4.3	7.9	8.5	10.3	8.6	9.8	8.5	8.7	8.3	7.8	6.4	5.1	5.9

All of these figures suggest that legislative and DRC efforts for community punishment and treatment alternatives for less serious offenders (both SB2 in 1996 and HB 86 in 2011) are resulting in an intake population that contains a higher proportion of violent/more serious offenders and a smaller proportion of truly non-violent offenders.